



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/834,253	04/12/2001	Yashavantkumar J. Asher	Sorrento-Asher et al.	2733

7590 03/18/2003

Peter K. Sommer, Esq.
Phillips, Lytle, Hitchcock, Blaine & Huber LLP
Intellectual Property Group
3400 HSBC Center
Buffalo, NY 14203

EXAMINER

WONG, LESLIE A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1761	5

DATE MAILED: 03/18/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/834,253	Applicant(s) Asher et al.
	Examiner Leslie Wong	Art Unit 1761
<i>-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --</i>		
Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>three</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). 		
Status		
1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>Dec 23, 2002</u>		
2a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> This action is FINAL . 2b) <input type="checkbox"/> This action is non-final.		
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.		
Disposition of Claims		
4) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>1-13</u> is/are pending in the application.		
4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.		
5) <input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.		
6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>1-13</u> is/are rejected.		
7) <input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.		
8) <input type="checkbox"/> Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.		
Application Papers		
9) <input type="checkbox"/> The specification is objected to by the Examiner.		
10) <input type="checkbox"/> The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) <input type="checkbox"/> accepted or b) <input type="checkbox"/> objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).		
11) <input type="checkbox"/> The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) <input type="checkbox"/> approved b) <input type="checkbox"/> disapproved by the Examiner. If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.		
12) <input type="checkbox"/> The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		
13) <input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) <input type="checkbox"/> All b) <input type="checkbox"/> Some* c) <input type="checkbox"/> None of: 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____. 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).		
*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.		
14) <input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e). a) <input type="checkbox"/> The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.		
15) <input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.		
Attachment(s)		
1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		
4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____		
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		
5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)		
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____		
6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____		

Art Unit: 1761

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dupas et al in view of Miller et al, Carpenter et al, and McMahon et al for the reasons set forth in rejecting the claims in the last Office action (Paper No. 5).

Dupas et al disclose a co-extruded composite cheese product (see entire document).

The claims differ as to the use of additional components.

Miller et al disclose a cheese comprising starch and maltodextrin (see entire patent, especially claims 1, 3, 6, 10 and 11)

Carpenter et al disclose a cheese composition comprising starch and a hydrocolloid stabilizer such as xanthan and locust bean gum (see entire patent, especially claims 1, 3, and 4).

McMahon et al disclose cheese comprising starches and gums as stabilizers (see entire patent, especially claims 1, 5, and 7).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to use any of the stabilizers taught by Miller et al, Carpenter et al, and McMahon et al in that of Dupas et al because the use of stabilizers in cheese products is well-

Art Unit: 1761

known and within the skill of the art. The stabilizers are used for no more than their art-recognized function.

Applicant's arguments filed December 23, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the prior art does not teach the use of stabilizers in a non-cheese core normally flowable at room temperature, the process described on pages 5-7, or a non-cheese product that does not leak or flow at room temperature.

Miller et al, Carpenter et al, and McMahon et al clearly teach the use of stabilizers in cheese compositions.

It is not seen where Applicant finds support for "leakage" in Dupas et al. Overrun as used by Dupas et al (see column 5, lines 6-10 and 36-45) refers to aeration of the core. This concept is notoriously well-known in the art. Overrun does not refer to leakage.

All of Applicant's claimed components are taught by the prior art. It is not seen where Applicant obtains anything other than expected results.

Applicant's claims are directed to a product where the process disclosed in the specification is not claimed.

The recitation that the product is made by a new process, if the process were indeed new and patentable, does not render an otherwise unpatentable product new and patentable. It is pointed out that the claims are product claims and not process claims. The product must stand on

Art Unit: 1761

its own invention, independently of the process of producing same. See *In re Marosi*, 218 USPQ 195; *In re Thorpe*, 227 USPQ 964; *Ex parte Jungfer*, 18 USPQ 2nd 1976.

Attention is invited to *In re Levin*, 84 USPQ 232 and the cases cited therein, which are considered in point in the fact situation of the instant case, and wherein the Court stated on page 234 as follows:

This court has taken the position that new recipes or formulas for cooking food which involve the addition or elimination of common ingredients, or for treating them in ways which differ from the former practice, do not amount to invention, merely because it is not disclosed that, in the constantly developing art of preparing food, no one else ever did the particular thing upon which the applicant asserts his right to a patent. In all such cases, there is nothing patentable unless the applicant by a proper showing further establishes a coaction or cooperative relationship between the selected ingredients which produces a new, unexpected, and useful function. *In re Benjamin D. White*, 17 C.C.P.A. (Patents) 956, 39 F.2d 974, 5 USPQ 267; *In re Mason et al.*, 33 C.C.P.A. (Patents) 1144, 156 F.2d 189, 70 USPQ 221.

In the absence of unexpected results, it is not seen how the claimed invention differs from the teachings of the prior art. Applicant's claims are drawn to a combination of known components which produces expected results, see *In re Kerkhoven* 205 USPQ 1069 and *In re Gershon* 152 USPQ 602.

All of the claim limitations and arguments have been considered. None of them are seen as serving as basis for patentability.

No claim is allowed.

Olds (US Patent No. 4482575) is cited to show the conventional use of overrun in cheese products and is not applied to the claims of record.

Art Unit: 1761

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a).

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST RESPONSE IS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE THREE-MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT WILL THE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leslie Wong whose telephone number is (703) 308-1979. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday.

The fax number for this Group is (703) 872-9310 for non-final responses and (703) 872-9311 for after-final responses.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.



**Leslie Wong
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1761**

LAW
March 14, 2003